DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 055 240	08	VT 014 100
AUTHOR	Brandau, George C.	
TITLE	The Development of Individualized Instruction in Vocational Education. Final Report.	
INSTITUTION	Willingboro Public School District, N.J.	
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.	
BUREAU NO	BR-9-0538	
PUB DATE	28 Dec 70	
GRANT	OEG-0-9-400538-4586(010)	
NOTE	73p.; Report dealing with the teacher training institute held at Willingboro Memorial Junior High School (Willingboro, N.J., July 21-August 3, 1969)	
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29	
DESCRIPTORS	*Behavioral Objectives; Change Agents; *Educational Change; Educational Innovation; *Individualized Instruction; *Inservice Education; Instructional Materials; Program Development; Summer Institutes; Teacher Workshops; *Vocational Education; Vocational Education Teachers	
IDENTIFIERS	ES 70	

ABSTRACT

This teacher training institute was aimed primarily at developing teacher efficiency in the writing of behavioral objectives and in developing individualized instructional programs. The grant for the inservice program came as a result of communication between the schools of the ES '70 network which highlighted the need for training in these areas, including the construction of learning packages. Therefore, it was a major objective of the institute to encourage development of skills in writing behavioral objectives, with the hope that participants would apply these skills in implementing individualized programs in their home districts. A followup workshop, which addressed the institution of change and the role of the change agent, was conceived as a result of difficulties encountered by the above ES '70 schools in implementing new programs. Specific attention was given to the problems encountered when one attempts to change curriculum and methodology in the high schools. An evaluation of both sessions is included in this report. (JS)

BR9-0538
PA 08
VT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED055240

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 9-0538
Grant No. OEG-0-9-400538-4586 (010)

(1) The Development of Individualized Instruction In Vocational Education
George C. Brandau, Author

(2) ES'70 Workshop, Santa Fe Network Meeting
Thomas S. Dietz, Author

Thomas S. Dietz, Director
Willingboro Public Schools
Willingboro, New Jersey 08046

December 28, 1970

U. S. Department of
Health, Education, and Welfare

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

VT014100

This program was carried out in two parts. The first workshop was held in the summer of 1969 under the immediate direction of George C. Brandau then Principal of Willingboro Memorial Junior High School. The second portion of the program was the two-day workshop held in March 1970 in Santa Fe under the direction of Thomas S. Dietz who was program administrator for both sections of the inservice effort. Mr. Brandau is the author of the report on the summer workshop.

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 9-0538
Grant No. OEG-0-9-400538-4586 (010)

The Development of Individualized Instruction In Vocational Education

George C. Brandau, Principal
Willingboro Memorial Junior High School

Willingboro Public Schools
Willingboro, New Jersey

December 28, 1970

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgement in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. Department of
Health, Education, and Welfare

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

PREFACE

This report deals with the teacher training institute held at the Willingboro Memorial Junior High School in Willingboro, New Jersey from July 21 to August 3, 1969. The Institute was entitled "The Development of Individualized Instruction in Vocational Education", and it was funded through the Vocational Act through a grant from the Office of Education.

The basic objective of the grant was to provide a training ground for curricular action which would provide opportunities for participants to gain efficiency in the writing of behavioral objectives designed to provide a program of individualized instruction through the use of student instructional packages. The Institute further aimed at making the participants aware of the use of the taxonomy in developing valid objectives and in constructing the task analysis as a systematic means of developing a meaningful program in a given discipline.

The Instritute was aimed primarily at the development of vocational objectives. However, the material presented could be applied to any disciplinary area and therefore was valuable to all teachers. As you look at the schedule in Appendix B of this report you will see that the resource people, the films, and the various other media for instruction, centered on the aspect of vocational education.

This grant came about as a result of communication between the schools of the ES '70 network, where it became apparent that some type of training institute should be developed to provide basic orientation to the writing of behavioral objectives and the construction of learning packages, to implement an individualized instructional program, which was the basic tenet of the ES '70 network.

In this light, the Office of Education saw fit to approve a Grant which utilized a training program for teachers that had been in use at the Willingboro Memorial Junior High School during the year '68-'69 as a method for training teachers in the use of behavioral objectives and instructional learning packages to implement a program of individualized instruction in the classroom. This program, which had been developed by the principal, George C. Brandau, had been most successful in bringing about a complete orientation for the teachers of that building and it was felt in later discussions with Mr. David Bushnell and Mr. Robert Pruitt at the U. S. Office that such a program could well be the foundation for a successful institute to train teachers in this manner.

Therefore, an institute was planned under the direction of Mr. Brandau and including other staff members from the Willingboro district who prepared an institute schedule utilizing this program as well as other resource personnel and materials. The following report deals with this teacher training institute and a follow-up study conducted with the participants in their home districts.

SUMMARY

The institute, developed through a vocational grant, was specifically designed to implement a program of orientation for teachers that would enable them to develop individualized instruction within their home district. The method of such implementation was suggested in terms of a vehicle called an instructional learning package which would enable all the facets of self-motivation, self-direction, pacing, and self-evaluation to take place in an individualized manner in the classroom. This learning package would be based upon sound behaviorally stated objectives and related to meaningful and realistic concepts that could be validated through a specific task analysis on the part of the teacher. A strong foundation in the writing of behavioral objectives and the knowledge necessary to construct a meaningful learning package would then place the participants in a position to carry on an action program of implementation in their home district. This was the basis for the development of this summer institute.

In providing for the training and the design of an action program for implementation in the home school district, the training institute falls into five basic areas for consideration:

1. Participants would be fully oriented in the use of behavioral objectives and the construction of student learning packages by utilizing the existing training program developed at Willingboro Memorial as an in-service program for their faculty. This program, which was highly successful in orienting the teachers at Memorial, deals with 12 levels aimed at providing a full knowledge and awareness of individualized instruction, behavioral objectives, taxonomic application, the task analysis, and the structure of the actual learning package.

2. The summer program was specifically designed to provide individualization on the part of the participants whereby they would progress through 12 segments of the program using instructional learning packets similar to those that would be later devised for student use in the classroom. In this way the participants would be exposed to the same type of learning conditions that the student would be exposed to, and would therefore gain greater insight into this type of individualization.

3. The instructional learning packages provide for a broad span of varied learning experiences so that the students can partake of self-direction and selectivity. The participants at this institute would operate in the same vein, whereby varied resources such as outside speakers, film, filmstrips, film loops, auio tapes, video tapes, individual conferences, and plateau group discussions would all be utilized to initiate the learning process similar to that which would be carried on by students in the classroom. This would also provide an opportunity for the participants to proceed at a rate with their particular level of efficiency in dealing with behavioral objectives and learning packages.

4. Definite suggestions would be offered to initiate an action program for the implementation of individualized instruction in the home district. This would include methods of scheduling whereby department members would be free for in-service program, the use of the bibliography to provide adequate materials on hand for teacher training, the position of leadership and how it must be implemented in relation to an action program, and the personnel involved in terms of teachers who would participate in the development of implementation.

5. The institute would, finally, conduct a follow-up study through the use of an extensive questionnaire which will be found in this report under Appendix E-1. This questionnaire will seek to determine actual practices carried on in the home district by the participants as late as three or four months after the resumption of school in the Fall. The follow-up study would also include the mailing of sample learning packages from the institute and from the participating schools as a sharing of materials developed. It was further hoped that continued lines of communication would be opened in the sharing of instructional materials between the network schools as a result of this endeavor.

An analysis of the outcome of the teacher training institute for individualized instruction would encompass a number of positive factors. The institute can be classified as an intense period of training covering three weeks which included a 7 to 8 hour day, and involved numerous hours in the evenings, varying with the individual enthusiasm of the participant. However, the following outcomes can be specifically stated in terms of the results of the institute:

1. Every participant actually wrote behavioral objectives and finally constructed an instructional learning package that was acceptable to the staff members.

2. The institute brought about the exchange of some materials that were developed after the institute. This however, is disappointing in terms of percentage of response.

3. It is quite obvious that school districts do not provide adequate programs of teacher training or in-service orientation. This will be more clearly pointed out in the responses found in Appendix E-3. The majority of participants who returned to their schools did not have their services utilized, nor were they called upon to spread the information acquired at the summer institute.

4. The program, as conducted, was viewed as very successful and this is substantiated by the follow-up study and the remarks of the participants. However, again, the home districts generally failed to implement an orientation program that would further develop action in the home district.

In conclusion it is very apparent that the participating schools continue to evidence an interest in individualized instruction, behavioral objectives, and learning packages. But they fail to implement an action program across the board for any number of reasons. The conclusions of the staff of the summer institute at Willingboro make the following suggestions:

1. Schools who are interested in implementing an individualized program must secure an educational leader for the development of a program who will have the time, energy, and resources to conduct a full in-service program with the teachers.

2. Suggestions for in-service training including revised scheduling techniques, additional free time, and the selection of personnel who are willing to meet the challenge, are all facets that are necessary for success.

3. The education of all levels concerned with a new program is imperative. This would include the administrators, the teachers, parents and the students who would be involved in an action program of individualized instruction.

4. The final comment - and the most important one for any participating district - is simply to "be committed". For without the actual commitment we are merely reverting to the traditional study group, pilot program, or curricular committee that for so many years in education has provided little but boredom for the professionals involved.

INTRODUCTION

The teacher training institute for Vocational Education held in Willingboro during the summer of 1969 included 40 participants from the ES '70 network and local communities in the South Jersey region. The list of participants and their home districts can be found in Appendix A at the end of this report. The particpants came to the institute with varying degrees of proficiency in the writing of behavioral objectives and the construction of instructional learning packages for student use. Some participants were involved in district-wide programs for the development of individualized instruction while others arrived with no previous training whatsoever. The basic objectives of the institute were as follows:

1. Participants were to be exposed to the basic facets of an individualized program of instruction which would include components of pacing, self-direction, self-motivation, self-evaluation, branching, enrichment, and multi-media approach. An action program for implementation of individualization was a basic goal of the institute.

2. Participants were to be schooled in the writing and development of valid behavioral objectives which would include the structure of performance, conditions, and achievement level to fulfill the basic requirements of a sound objective. Not only were behavioral objectives to be developed, but they were further to be analyzed in terms of valid and realistic objectives for a meaningful curriculum.

3. The actual construction of instructional learning packages was to be developed with the participants engaging in the construction of learning packages of a disciplinary area of their choice which would be acceptable as instructional vehicles for student use. These packages would be exchanged among the members of the institute.

4. Participants were to be offered a systematic program for implementation of individualization within their home districts. This would include plans for in-service programs, schedule allocations, and the development of proper personnel and leadership to carry out the program.

With these basic objectives in mind an institute staff and proper consultants were brought together for the development of a program for the summer institute. The basic staff of the institute included George C. Brandau, Director and Principal of the Memorial Junior High School; Marcel F. Gilbert, Assistant Superintendent of the Willingboro District; Joseph S. Kaufman, Principal of Abraham Levitt Junior High School; and Joseph E. O'Donnell, Vice Principal of the Abraham Levitt

Junior High. This basic instructional staff were all members who had played an integral part in the development of behavioral objectives and learning packages in the programmed approach for individualization being utilized at the junior high level in the Willingboro District. Each staff member accepted a responsibility for a particular facet of the program where they could show expertise in dealing with the participants and their progress. In addition to this basic staff, a number of outstanding consultants were called upon to add to the general tempo of the institute. Dr. Bruce Tuckman of Rutgers University made a presentation on the organic curriculum; Mr. Kenneth Smith of the Nova Schools made a presentation on the Nova Tech-Science program; Dr. Robert Worthington, Asst. Commissioner of Education in New Jersey discussed innovative trends in vocational education; Mr. George Love, the Philadelphia District, reviewed the progress of the University-High School based upon inter-disciplinary objectives; and Dr. Richard Bell of Ampex Corporation gave a presentation on media in education. In addition to this, the department chairmen of the Willingboro Memorial Junior High School worked closely on disciplinary areas with the participants, and Mrs. Olive Sedinger, the LRC Director reviewed the role of the Learning Resource Center with an individualized approach. You are referred to Appendix B for the complete schedule of the institute and the topics of discussion for the staff members, the consultants, and the visiting guests.

The general program of the institute centered around two weeks of intense activities on the part of the participants in moving through a systematic program of 12 learning packets based upon the various facets of individualized instruction and utilizing behavioral objectives and learning activity packages specifically designed as an in-service program. In addition to the daily schedule running from 9 in the morning until 3:30 in the afternoon, there were numerous other activities such as field trips to vocational installations, a wide variety of films and video-tapes and the previously mentioned visitations of consultants and guest speakers in the field. The third and final week of the institute was devoted to team meetings on a district level. ES '70 coordinators and principals from the home district were invited to attend during this third week, and sit in to form an action program to be carried on in the home district at the termination of the institute. A few of the administrators did attend and from the results of the follow-up study seriously worked at developing an in-service program for the implementation of individualization the following year.

The institute also featured a wide diversity of materials that were provided for the participants in terms of audio tapes, transparencies, film loops, and orientation programs. Most of these materials had been developed in the Willingboro Memorial Junior High School as an in-service program for their teachers in the Fall of the previous year. Having been highly successful within the faculty of the Memorial Junior High, the materials were introduced into the institute in the same manner as a method of providing an individualized in-service program for the participants. Also provided were samples of work accomplished in other districts such as Nova, Florida; Portland, Oregon; and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

In addition to the scheduled program dealing with behavioral objectives and instructional learning packages, the institute provided a number of additional features including group inter-acting discussion; computerized education; the child-oriented curriculum; various multi-media approaches to learning; educational television; and the inter-disciplinary approach as presented by Dr. Tuckman and Mr. George Love. All of these additional features were received favorably and had a profound influence on the actual writing of objectives by the institute participants.

The consultants who were engaged by the institute provided a wide scope of educational experiences. This ranged from the organic curriculum of SCOPE presented by Dr. Bruce Tuckman, through the Tech-Science program as an emerging curriculum at Nova, discussed by Kenneth Smith, to the University-High School Inter-Disciplinary approach reviewed by Mr. George Love of the Philadelphia District. Trends in vocational education were brought to the attention of the participant members by Dr. Robert Worthington of the New Jersey Department of Education, and the newest ideas in the realm of media were discussed by Dr. Richard Bell. A final aspect of the total program was the third week schedule involving the presentation by educational material companies such as 3M, Addressograph-Multigraph, Ampex, and Kodak, as firms who set up displays and reviewed the latest equipment and techniques for the members of the institute. All of these presentations were geared directly at the problems associated with reproduction of materials and development of multi-media. In this sense they were most profitable to the members. This is substantiated by the results of the questionnaire found in Appendix C.

A final summary of the institute would indicate that it was three weeks of intense activity on the part of the participants and that generally speaking the planned schedule fulfilled the aspirations of the institute staff.

METHODS

The actual procedures affiliated with the summer teacher training institute at Willingboro centered around the successful orientation program that had been developed earlier in the Memorial Junior High School. This program was a series of 12 segments dealing with the component parts of individualized instruction through behavioral objectives and learning packages. It provided an individualized approach in that the segments of the program were developed into learning packages for teacher use whereby individuals could move at their own rate, pacing themselves through this in-service program commensurate with their experience and ability levels. This was exceptionally well-adapted to the summer institute since we had previously mentioned that the participants came at all levels of proficiency in terms of developing behavioral objectives and learning packages. Consequently, after the first day, there began to be a definite fan-out in terms of the participants moving at different levels of the program according to their own past experiences.

The orientation program itself centered around the individualized procedures for each participant whereby through self-direction and individual pacing the participants could progress through the program at their own speed. This was essentially geared to present the same type of learning situation that would be developed for students in an individualized program featuring learning packages. Each segment contained the following materials in support of the learning package:

1. A written orientation
2. Audio cassette tapes
3. Over-head projector transparencies
4. Duplicated (Dittoed) pre-and post-tests
5. Segments of Vimcet
6. Graphic materials and charts
7. Video tapes
8. Films and film strips
9. Plateau discussion groups
10. Staff institute conference

The daily schedule called for the beginning of activities at 9:00 a.m. with the total group participating in some formal presentation such as a film, a slide, a guest lecturer, or a staff member presentation. The remainder of the morning was devoted to the individual pursuits of the participants with various short-term plateau discussion groups held in the seminar rooms. The afternoon sessions were devoted to field trips, plateau inter-action, individualization, and a special problem session at 3:00 p.m. each day. Through the entire period of the institute the total scope of materials were available on shelves for participant selection with the hardware for multi-media use available in adjoining conference rooms.

The people of this orientation program [illegible] centered

The scope of the orientation program itself centered around 12 basic segments. They are as follows:

1. Individualized instruction
2. The instructional package format
3. Behavioral objectives - structure
4. Behavioral objectives - recognition and development
5. Sample disciplinary objectives
6. Verbal and motor skills
7. Criteria test items
8. Taxonomy
9. Task analysis - structure
10. Task analysis - development
11. Terminal and interim objectives
12. The learning package - resources

This span of component parts in support of individualization, the use of behavioral objectives, and the construction of student learning packages, was most comprehensive in providing a meaningful and systematic approach to the mastery over the basic objectives of the institute.

During the individualized approach the four staff members plus consultants who were available at specified times, were free to move about the facilities assisting individuals or engaging in plateau group discussions. The close supervision was in essence, and the post-testing evaluation was expressly, controlled by the institute staff members. The participants were not committed to go on to the next level until they had satisfactorily achieved mastery over the previous segment through the use of the written post-tests. In the comments and responses found in Appendix C and E it is quite evident that the participants felt these learning experiences to be quite valid.

A word must be said about the field trips undertaken by the institute. The participants' reactions to the field trips was not exceptional. It must be tempered with the fact that the weather was extremely hot and humid and the long bus trips were certainly not received in a joyous manner. However, we would be remiss if we did not make mention of the three visitations carried on. The first was a visit to the Instructo Corporation in Paoli, outside Philadelphia, where various media for education were produced. This gave the participants an excellent opportunity to see exactly what was on the market and how it could be utilized in relation to instructional learning packages. The second field trip was also to Philadelphia, to the installation of the computer-assisted instruction for the Philadelphia District, sponsored by the Philco-Ford Corporation. Here the participants had a first-hand presentation of how CAI actually works with demonstrations of the actual computers involved. The third trip was to the local Burlington County Technical-Vocational School. This institution was only 2 years old, and incorporated some of the most modern ideas in the development of vocational-technical training. Based upon the various technical industries the school offered many innovations in the training of students for job entry level skills and was an invaluable device for the vocational teachers who were attending the institute. In addition to the daily program

the formal presentation, and the inter-acting plateau group discussions, the participants actually had the opportunity to develop portions of their instructional packages on video tape in the television installation at the Memorial Junior High. In this sense the institute again was providing realistic opportunities for the participant members to carry on activities similar to those developed for a program in their home district. Every opportunity was presented for fulfilling the needs of the individual participants in helping them to develop a full program for implementation in their home districts.

The reader is again referred to Appendix B which outlines the full schedule of activities and the method by which the institute promulgated the objective. In conclusion it is felt that the intensity of the institute in terms of the contributions of the participants was very high and most satisfactory, and the follow-up study and questionnaire seems to strongly indicate it was a most profitable experience for all.

RESULTS

The results of the teacher training institute can be divided into two basic categories:

The individual progress
The follow-up activities

The actual success of the institute in relation to the participants progress from his point of entry is well established from data presented in Appendix C. In this immediate evaluation at the completion of the three week training program, the participants rated the overall program 85% highly effective and 10% moderately effective. The staff analysis of the general effectiveness of the program was also very high. Criteria for evaluation were:

mastery in writing Behavioral Objectives
mastery in constructing a learning package
mastery of the concepts of individualized instruction

With three segments of the program devoted to the development of sound Behavioral Objectives, every participant had ample opportunity to develop knowledge and skill in this area. Appendix C tells us that the participants rated the staff members as 95% highly effective which was a prime factor in assisting in the mastery of the program segments. The institute staff prided itself in the progress shown in the writing of Behavioral Objectives, especially with members who began the institute at ground zero in this realm.

All participants completed a Learning Package as a requirement of the institute. The staff members were again more than satisfied with the broad format and large span of learning activities included in these packages. Many institute members supplemented their packages with actual video tapes developed in the Memorial TV studio, while others utilized audio-tapes, transparencies, and various visual applications as well as specific reading references from the LRC areas.

The general format of the institute featured many varied experiences to foster mastery over the concepts of individualized instruction. This included the valuable contributions of guest speakers such as Dr. Bruce Tuckman, Robert Pruitt, Dr. Robert Worthington, and Kenneth Smith. Also, numerous films specifically aimed at individualization were included in the scheduled activities. "A New Look at an Old Log" was exceptionally well received.

The total outcomes in terms of measured success of participant progress in the three areas discussed was more than satisfactory. The follow-up study and participant evaluation substantiate this view.

The results of the follow-up study were not as satisfying as the tempo of the actual institute. The follow-up study was to accomplish four things:

1. provide data on implementation
2. open lines of communication
3. stimulate the sharing of materials
4. evaluate the institute techniques

The responses to the follow-up questionnaire are presented by percentage in Appendix E-3. The reader is asked to draw conclusions on his own from this data. Basically, we are given the implication that the home districts fail to utilize the talents of the trainees to any extent after their return from the institute. The general response from the participants was also disappointing with only 22 out of 40 members returning the questionnaire. Of the 22 responses, only four members included any information or sample material of their programs.

The evaluation of the techniques of the institute indicated a high degree of success in most areas. Negative comments generally referred to the accommodations provided for housing and the field trips taken in the humid weather.

Here are some narrative comments added to the follow-up questionnaire which reveal some of the basic problems of implementation:

"Direction has thus far found focus on one school and certain departments within that high school, with efforts to involve total faculty interest in the possibilities of the use of behavioral objectives and the learning packages!!

"Future workshops must be utilized to map out or iron out difficulties in implementing an individualized program."

"I rewrote some of the packets and included sample objectives at a low el. elementary level."

"The largest obstacle is teacher readiness to convert from traditional methods where one feels secure to an individualized instruction process. Teachers have a tendency to revert to traditional methods if not fully committed to the individualized concept."

"Would be interested in any advanced or follow-up program if it develops."

"Orient and train administrators as well as staff people.....Have systems bring to a future workshop what they have developed and exchange ideas and information...."

"Teachers are reluctant to change.....They are not being encouraged by the building administrators..."

"Lack of time for teacher-training and indoctrination...and lack of illustrative material to distribute to teachers and supervisors to convert them to L.P.'s."

"Most of the problems stem from untrained teachers in the use of packets and this lack of understanding causes teachers to avoid packets and behavioral objectives."

CONCLUSIONS

The final analysis of the effectiveness of the summer institute on teacher training in the area of Individualized Instruction in Vocational Education gives strong support to the format used as a successful teacher-training device to develop mastery in the writing of Behavioral Objectives and the construction of student learning packages. The general idea of utilizing an individualized approach through teacher training packets was quite rewarding. The broad span of activities and resources made available provided ample opportunity for a continuous learning program that was highly effective.

Briefly, some very specific conclusions can be listed for consideration:

1. All participants enjoyed success in attaining the original objectives
2. The great majority of members returned to their home districts with great enthusiasm for future developments
3. Individual contributions during the institute were evaluated very highly
4. From follow-up data, few districts utilized the services of the participants and they were left to die on the vine with their enthusiasm
5. Vigorous leadership is needed in a district which desires change
6. Administration must be committed
7. Vigorous in-service programs are needed across the board
8. The institute was most beneficial to those who started at point zero
9. Future institutes should be carried on, but funded earlier
10. Willingboro is conducting a district-wide in-service successfully through levels K-12.

APPENDIX A

SUMMER INSTITUTE PARTICIPANTS

1. Mr. George Eckman, Cherry Hill, New Jersey
2. Mr. Lawrence Ayers, Portland, Oregon
3. Mr. Leslie H. Jones, Philadelphia, Pa.
4. Mr. Joseph H. Putro, Philadelphia, Pa.
5. Mr. Gene Buckingham, Boulder, Colo.
6. Mr. Joseph Fusaro, Boulder, Colo.
7. Mr. Robert F. Raikes, Boulder, Colo.
8. Mr. George Clark, San Antonio, Texas
9. Mrs. Ruth Coale, San Antonio, Texas
10. Mrs. Bessie Bryant, San Antonio, Texas
11. Mr. Donald Marks, Willingboro, N. J.
12. Mr. George Bulotovich, Willingboro, N. J.
13. Mr. Leonard Patrizzi, Willingboro, N. J.
14. Mr. Francis Lombardi, Willingboro, N. J.
15. Miss Anita Latini, Willingboro, N. J.
16. Mr. William Kane, Willingboro, N. J.
17. Mrs. H. D. Gatewood, Houston, Texas
18. Mr. William Roller, Willingboro, N. J.
19. Mr. John Heinz, Willingboro, N. J.
20. Dr. Joan Berbrich, Mineola, New York
21. Mr. Joseph L. Besosa, Mineola, New York
22. Mr. Guy H. Brock, Mineola, New York
23. Mrs. Louise Petraglia, Mineola, New York
24. Mr. Arthur Vita, Mineola, New York
25. Mr. Joseph Vitale, Monroe, Michigan
26. Mr. Anthony Konstant, Baltimore, Maryland
27. Mr. Bertram Merritt, Baltimore, Maryland
28. Mr. Dudley Henry, Baltimore, Maryland
29. Elizabeth Bader, Baltimore, Maryland
30. Mr. Theodore Rybka, Baltimore, Maryland
31. Mrs. S. N. Geister, Baltimore, Maryland
32. Mr. Paul Braungart, Voorhees Township, N. J.
33. Mr. Troy Nuckols, San Mateo, California
34. Mrs. Rhoda Fishkin, Mineola, New York
35. Evonne Jackson, Baltimore, Maryland
36. Una Ray Balch, Portland, Oregon
37. Joseph Nicastro, Quincy, Mass.
38. Frank Leporini, Quincy, Mass.
39. Mrs. Roberta Deason, Houston, Texas
40. Herman Bainder, Baltimore, Maryland

SUMMER INSTITUTE ACTION WORKSHOP

FIRST WEEK

DATE	JULY 21	JULY 22	JULY 23	JULY 24	JULY 25
9:00	Get acquainted coffee Intro. of Staff & Participants. Dr. Reuben -- Welcome.	Film: "How Good are our Schools?" Individual Pacing Via L.P.	Staff Present #3 Behavior Objectives (Mr. Gilbert)	Film: " Individual Differences" Individual Pacing Via L. P.	Inter-Discipline Workshops under Dept. Chairman (Examples: Discussion writing)
10:00	COFFEE Kickoff Speaker -- Innovative Learning (B. Pruitt) Film:"No Reason To Stay"	COFFEE Staff Presentation	Individual Pacing Via. L. P. COFFEE	COFFEE Staff Presentation	COFFEE
11:00	Orientation to Program and Facilities (G. Brandau)	#2 Learning Package (Kaufman) Plateau Groups Discussion	Plateau Groups Discussion	#5 Sample Object (Brandau) Individual Pacing Plateau Group Discussion	General Evaluation by Group
1:00	Introduction to Individualized Instruction. (Brandau) Issue L. P. 's	Visitation "Computer Education"	Films: " Importance of Goals" Staff Presentation #4 Behavior Objectives (O'Donnell)	Visitation "Implementing the Learning Process."	Staff Presentation "Verbal & Motor Skills" (Kaufman)
2:00	Individual Pacing Via L. P.	Philco - Ford Bus Trip	Individual Pacing Via LP	Abington (?) Bus Trip	Individual Pacing Via L. P.
3:00	Plateau Groups Discussion		Plateau Groups Discussion		Plateau Groups Discussion
Evening	Gilbert	Brandau	Kaufman	O'Donnell	

15. 18

SUMMER INSTITUTE ACTION WORKSHOP
SECOND WEEK

	July 28	July 29	July 30	July 31	August 1
9:00 AM	Film: "A New Look At an Old Log". Questions & Discussion	Film: " Computor Assisted Instruction ". CAI. --- Staff Presentation: #9 "Task Analysis: Structure"(Brandau)	Staff Presentation: #10, Task Analysis Development(Gilbert) --- Individual Pacing Via L. P.	Staff Presentation: #12 " Learning Package: (Kaufman)	"Interdisciplinary Objectives" George Love Presentation. Questions and Discussion
10:00 AM	Coffee (O'Donnell) Staff Presentation #7 "Criteria Test Items"	Coffee Individual Pacing Via L. P.	Coffee	Coffee Individual Pacing Via L. P.	Coffee Workshop " Development of Learning Packages" Staff
11:00 AM	Individual Pacing Via. L. P.	Plateau Groups Discussion	Plateau Groups Discussion Film: " Programmed Instruction "	Plateau Groups Discussion Resources & LRC (Olive Sedinger)	
1:00 PM	Demonstration P. E. Girls "Behavioral Objectives in the Gym" Miss Henry	Visitation " New Concepts in Vocational Training"	Staff Presentation #11 "Terminal & Interim Object" (Brandau)		Sample L. P. " Japanese"
2:00 PM	Staff Presentation #8 "Taxonomy" (.Kaufman) --- Individual Pacing Via L. P.	Burlington County Technical & Vocational School Bus Trip	Individual Pacing Via L. P.		Participant Present sample L.P's
3:00 PM	Plateau Groups Discussion		Plateau Groups Discussion		
Evening	Gilbert	Brandau	O'Donnell	Kaufman	

SUMMER INSTITUTE ACTION WORKSHOP
THIRD WEEK

	August 4	August 5	August 6	August 7	August 8
9:00 AM	"Student -- Centered Curriculum" Dr. Bruce Tuckman & Staff.	------- RESOURCE PERSON PRESENTATION ------- "Achieving The Expected -- Vocational Education"	"The Merging Program of Tech. Science."(Smith)	"Mobilization for Action " (Brandau)	"Educational Television:" Dr. R. Bell
10:00 AM	Coffee QUESTIONS & DISCUSSION	Coffee QUESTIONS & DISCUSSION	Coffee QUESTIONS & DISCUSSION	Coffee QUESTIONS & DISCUSSION	QUESTIONS & DISCUSSIO
11:00 AM	"Developing Vocational Instruction"	Dr. Worthington, N.J. State Dept."Innova-- tions for Vocational Education:"	" Flexible Scheduling" (M. Gilbert)	Film: " Television in Education	
1:00 PM	3-M Company	-------- INSTRUCTIONAL AIDS DEMONSTRATIONS ---------- Kodak (Visual Sound)	Ampex Corporation	Instructional Materials center Multi-Lith	" Final Group Conclusions:" Evaluation Form :
2:00 PM		-------- DISTRUCT GROUP MEETINGS FOR ACTION IMPLEMENTATION ----------			
3:00 PM					
Evening	Gilbert	Kaufman	O'Donnell	Brandau	

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION OF SUMMER INSTITUTE

1. In relation to meeting the objectives of the program, how would you evaluate the effectiveness of the ORIENTATION portion of the program?

2. The learning resource center of Willingboro Memorial Junior High School and tis auxillary spaces was selected as the facility in which the program objectives could be met through actual utilization in appropriate learning activities. How do you evaluate the effectiveness of this facility in meeting the program's objectives?

3. Learning packets were used to help you move at your own best pace and to "live" the concept of individualized instruction. How would you evaluate the effectiveness of the packets you used?

4. How would you evaluate the quality of the multi-media materials available to provide branching and relief reinforcement for the learning of the concepts and meeting the objectives?

5. How would you rate the availability (quantity, ease of use) of the Multi-media materials?

6. Each staff member was publicized as a specialist in one or more areas of concern in this program. How do you evaluate the effectiveness of the staff in relation to areas of specialization?

7. Each staff member was also available as a concultant on all learning packets. How would you evaluate the staff as generalists in this program?

8. The staff's intention was to work as a team as well as individually in such a manner as to demonstrate and encourage inthusiasm, and cooperation. How would you rate the effectiveness of this staff goal?

9. How would you rate the effectiveness of the time limitations of a 6½ hour day voluntary evening study in the building, and two weeks for the completion of the 12 packets?

10. Field trips were taken as supplemental learning exercises. How would you rate their effectiveness?

11. Speakers on various related topics were heard and discussion followed their presentations. How would you rate the effectiveness of the speakers in relation to the program objectives?

12. Presentations were made by various materials vendors. How would you rate their effectiveness?

13. "Plateau" discussion groups were part of the structural arrangements to help consolidate learnings and to share thoughts. How would you rate their effectiveness in reaching program goals?

14. How would you rate the over-all effectiveness of the program in helping you to meet the program's objectives?

15. Please indicate your present attitude to this evaluation instrument as a means for gathering your feelings concerning the present program so that future programs can be improved.

PERCENT RESPONSES FOR QUESTIONAIRE

QUESTION	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE	MODERATELY EFFECTIVE	RELATIVELY INEFFECTIVE	POOR
1	85%	10%	5%	
2	77%	23%		
3	67%	33%		
4	71%	24%	5%	
5	50%	36%	9%	5%
6	86%	9%	5%	
7	95%		5%	
8	91%	9%		
9	70%	25%		5%
10	5%	30%	30%	35%
11	32%	50	9%	9%
12	24%	52%	19%	5%
13	40%	45%	5%	
14	86%	9%	5%	
15	95%	5%		

APPENDIX D-1

TEACHER INSTITUTE

Willingboro Memorial Jr. High School

Summer - 1969

PROGRAM FORMAT

July 21-August 1	Participants involved in Individualized approach to developing behavioral objectives and learning packages.
August 4-August 8	Development of Instructional Packages and Planning for implementation of a program in the home district. Schedule of Resource Guests to present materials.

Individualized Procedures:

Participant learning package

- Written lesson
- audio tape
- overlays
- duplicated material
- vimcet segments
- graphic materials
- vidio tape
- films

Participant group interaction(plateau)

Formal staff presentations (plateau)

Individual developmental sessions (staff)

Daily Schedule:

9:00 a.m.	arrival
9:00 a.m.	formal presentation (film, slides, lecture)
10:00 a.m.	individualized procedures (staff help)
12:00	lunch
1:00 p.m.	Plateau groups presentation
1:30 p.m.	individualization
2:30 p.m.	plateau groups interact
3:00 p.m.	special problems session

Field trips were scheduled on several afternoons during the program

APPENDIX E-1

FOLLOW-UP SURVEY FOR WILLINGBORO
SUMMER WORKSHOP ON BEHAVIORAL
OBJECTIVES AND LEARNING PACKETS

NAME:_____POSITION_____

SCHOOL OR DISTRICT:_____

ADDRESS_____

DIRECTIONS: Please complete this survey and return it in the stamped, addressed envelope enclosed. Use the reverse side of the paper if your statements cannot fit in the space provided.

1. For all items which apply, please check those to whom you made a presentation concerning the Workshop and its ideas.

   _____total faculty _____superintendent _____principal

   _____department _____some colleagues _____P.T.A.

   _____newspapers _____no one _____others(please specify)

   _____

2. If there is a program established on behavioral objectives and learning packets.....

   a. is it for certain departments? _____List them:

      _____

   b. is it for the total staff of one school?_____

   c. is it for the total district?_____

   d. how many people are involved?_____

   e. what kinds of people are participating?

      _____teachers _____supervisors _____parents

      _____administrators

3. If there is no in-service program at present, are there plans to start one?

   _____yes _____no

3a. If you checked "yes," please write in date program is expected to start_____.

4. Are you making use, or do you plan to make use, of the packets and segments developed for your instruction in the summer Workshop?

_____yes _____no

5. Have you personally developed additional packets since returning to work?

_____yes _____no

5a. If yes, how many?_____

5b. In what area(s)?_____ _____

_____ _____ _____

5c. Would you be willing to share your packets with other districts if you receive packets from them?

_____yes _____no

6. Are others in your school or district developing packets?

_____yes _____no

6a. If yes, how many others?_____

6b. In what area(s)?_____ _____

_____ _____ _____

6c. Would these teachers be willing to share with other districts?

_____yes _____no

7. Has a scope and sequence of concepts been developed in any of the disciplines?

_____yes _____no

7a. If yes, what area(s)?_____ _____

_____ _____ _____

7b. Who worked on the development? (check all which apply)

____all teacher ____outside consultant ____committee

____district specialist ____others(please specify)

_____

8. Is your district doing, or planning to do, a task analysis to direct curriculum revision efforts?

_____yes _____no

9. If you are using packets in the classroom, or are supervising those who use them, what has been the student reaction to date?

____enthusiastic ____bored

____undetermined at present ____indifferent

____other (please specify)_____

10. If you are using packets in the classroom, how has their use affected your teaching? (Check all which apply)

____no change from previous years

____greater individualization possible

____greater and more accurate diagnosis of student learning needs

____greater flexibility and interest in prescribing learning activities relevant to student needs

____more relevant evaluation of student achievement

____others (please specify)_____

_____

11. Please list below any problems you encountered in your school or district in introducing the concept of individualizing instruction through the creation and use of behavioral objectives and learning packets. Also comment on successful produres used to overcome obstacles.

12. Please list below any problems you have encountered in using packets in the classroom. If you are a supervisor, please write about those problems you have observed or were brought to your attention by staff members. Also comment on any successful strategies used to overcome obstacles.

13. Now that some time has elapsed since the Workshop, do you have any further suggestions for improving the materials and/or procedures for any future workshops?

14. Please make any additional comments or suggestions concerning the areas questioned above and/or areas not covered in the Survey.

APPENDIX E-3

ANALYSIS OF PARTICIPANT REPSONSES TO FOLLOW-UP SURVEY
(Based upon 22 responses)

1. Presentation in Home District?	
to administration	38%
to faculty	32%
to department	41%
2. Presnt In-Service program?	
for department	41%
for total staff	14%
for district	18%
3. Plans to start In-Service Program?	
Yes	63%
No	---
4. Continued Use of Institute Materials?	
Yes	67%
No	---
5. Additional Learning Package Development?	
Yes	32%
No	32%
6. Others Developing Packages?	
Yes	63%
No	14%
7. Scope and Sequence of Concepts Developed?	
Yes	38%
No	38%
8. Task Analysis Completed?	
Yes	52%
No	14%
9. *Student Reaction to Learning Packages?	
enthusiastic	32%
undetermined	23%
bored	14%
10. *Effect of Learning Packages on teaching?	
no change	---
greater individualization	45%
accurate diagnosis of student needs	50%
greater flexibility	50%
more relevant evaluation	41%

* If Learning Packages were not being used, there were no responses to items 9 and 10.

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 9-0538
Grant No. OEG-0-9-400538-4586 (010)

ES'70 Workshop, Santa Fe Network Meeting

Thomas S. Dietz, Director

Willingboro Public Schools
Willingboro, New Jersey

December 28, 1970

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgement in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. Department of
Health, Education, and Welfare

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

PREFACE

For March 1970 Workshop

During the months immediately following the summer workshop of 1969, it became more and more apparent that the participating network schools were having difficulties in instituting change. During the summer workshop of 1969, the participants learned how to write behavioral objectives and learning packages. But this fine tool of education was not being used as widely as the participating schools had hoped for.

Therefore, at the suggestion of the network members the second workshop having to do with the institution of change and the role of the change agents was conceived.

SUMMARY

The principal activities of this workshop revolved around the following questions:

1. What should be the role of the ES'70 Coordinator? That is, the change agent and his immediate change agent, the principal.

2. What sorts of activities are within his rightful role?

3. How can he achieve the status and "power" he needs to achieve change?

4. What sort of a vehicle is necessary to affect change?

The workshop participants worked divided into groups A., B., and C. which rotated between group leaders. In order to get a more objective view of his own position each participant was assigned a role which he played in each group and with the revolving group leadership. The charge given to each individual was based upon the above questions. "Given your present situation, the hierarchy of power within which you work, the demands of the State Department of Education and the community, you are to prepare three methods for the implementation of change within your district. This must be cost free. If two of the three methods are accepted by the administration and board you may be considered successful in your efforts with the administration. If, when you attempt to implement your two methods one seems to be workable with the staff and building administrator you will be assumed an effective change agent. List the changes in your own behavior and the changes that occurred in the behavior of your colleagues. Outline the product of the change."

This difficult task was approached and the participants in their evaluations evidenced a changed feeling for their roles and a deeper appreciation of the problems of change agentry.

INTRODUCTION

Individuals who attempt to change a curriculum and methodology in our high schools are confronted with many time honored constraints. A partial listing would include administrative attitude, teacher attitude, teachers feeling of status, the methanics of scheduling, student feelings toward the professional staff, and the expectations of the community.

The lone change agent in such a school must be a diplomat, an educator, and a creative human being, yet even if he is all of these things he needs a method for change. He needs a direction. He needs to investigate and ascertain his position within the system he works. He needs to know just how far and how fast he can proceed.

Research has been done in the area by many groups. One of the outstanding contributions comes from the Northwestern Regional Laboratories and is published as RUPS - Research Utilization in Problem Solving. In addition, the Southwestern Regional Laboratories has been active in this area. Workshops of various design have been created on local and regional levels but few deal with basic changes envisioned by the concept of ES'70. Therefore, this two-day workshop was appropriate and designed for the special needs of ES'70 personnel.

METHODS

The methodology we employed had several steps. First, to remove the participants from his normal role in the school placing him in a role he might well find to be in opposition to his real role. (See appendix #1) Secondly, each participant was exposed to a group whose composition of make believe roles included his real role. Therefore, he might even be able to see himself in operation. Thirdly, the group leaders were selected carefully in an effort to create as much dialogue as possible about real problems or the attempt to find real solutions. (See appendix #2) There was an attempt on the part of the workshop administrator to set a mental tone through the use of the introduction. (See appendix #3) In order to reduce the number of definitions that the participants might attach to certain words a glossary (appendix #4) was attached to the introduction.

Further than this, Thoughts on The Responsive Curriculum, which is a basic ES'70 concept, was included in an attempt to stimulate thoughts about change. (See appendix #5) As the participants went through the agenda they began to sense a change within themselves which assisted them in perceiving through hometown roles as something different and more exciting. The initial reactions (appendix #6) were recorded at the close of the conference with each participant professing to have clarified his position as a change agent.

A final evaluation (appendix #7) which was gathered some sixty to ninety days after the workshop indicates that a conference was effective.

RESULTS

From a look at the summary figures gleaned from the final evaluation sheet it seems quite obvious that most people considered the two days as being in the range of "moderately effective" to "highly effective" as regards themselves and the announced purposed of the program.

However, as we look over the evaluations we can see that this certainly was not an unqualified success. It is the feeling of the author that the program merely touched the surface of this tremendously complicated and involved problem. It substantiates the author's personal hypothesis that attitudinal change through behavior change must be planned, sought after, and implemented on every level of the teaching hierarchy before change is to take place.

Further than this the results indicate the multitude of basic fears on the part of selected change agents.

CONCLUSIONS

It seems quite evident that this effort was insufficient due to the lack of time and sufficient personnel to carry the project to an end that would give lasting results.

There is much to be done in this area. The pace of change is ever increasing. Change agents and their colleagues must be given the methods and the opportunity to deal with personal inhibitions and the inter-personal constraints which are involved.

Simply having the tools necessary and the knowledge necessary to write behavioral objectives and learning packages is not enough. The individual who has this knowledge who can use and create behavioral objectives must have the methodology necessary to institute this and other basic changes in our curriculum efforts.

The area of further investigation seems, to this author, to be outlined especially for the behavioral scientist. An extension of Sarason's work seems to be demanded. (see Bibliography)

Bibliography

Maguire, Louis M. An Annotated Bibliography of the Literature on Change. Research for Better Schools, Inc., Phila., Penna., July 1970

Maguire, Louis M. Observations and Analysis of the Literature on Change. Research for Better Schools, Inc., Phila., Penna., June 1970

Educational Change Through State Leadership ESEA Title III. Dorsey Baynham, Editor, 1970

Sarason, Seymour B. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Allyn and Bacon, 1970

APPENDIX "1"

GROUP	PARTICIPANT	ROLE
A B	Eliot Spack George Love	A student who did like the learning packets.
A B	Stu Sergeant Bill Hetrick	An older superintendent convinced the individualized program is essential.
A B C	Ken Smith Milo Dalbey Chuck Mink	Young, ambitious superintendent convinced the individualized program is essential.
A B C	Bob Boston Mickey Sharrow Genie Pedersen	ES'70 Coordinator trying to convince a principal to change from traditional to an individualized environment.Not sold on ES'70.
A B C	Bill Reed Lucille Santos Larry Ayers	A student who thrives in individualized environment created by your school systems use of the learning packets.
A C	V. Lahourcade Bob Sutch	Principal of a high school trying to implement change.
A C	Blaine Zimmerman Mr. Meachem	Teacher in an individualized environment partly sold on use of packets but committed to this methodology and to administration.
A B	Tom Townsend Lloyd Creighton	ES'70 Coordinator sold on the program but you lack cooperation from the district's administrators.
A B	Dick Otte Sister Clarisse	Successful teacher, accepted by colleagues and see no reasons to change your approach to any sort of individualized program.
B C	John Hoback Art Pace	Student in an individualized environment who refuses to work on his learning packets.
C	Earl Bolton	Principal of large high school & reluctant to consider change.

NOTE: All the roles' positions were defended in terms of what the participant believed to be the good or evil of ES'70.

WILLINGBORO
New Jersey

You are an ES'70 Coordinator and you are trying to convince a principal that he must change from a traditional to an individualized environment but you are not sold on ES'70. All you have seen from ES'70 are Learning Packets and a lot of high-flown talk. Deep down inside you have a certain sympathy for the principal, but personally you are committed to change. Defend your position in terms of the good or evil you see in the ES'70 efforts to create change.

WILLINGBORO
New Jersey

You are an ES'70 Coordinator who is thoroughly sold on the program, but you lack cooperation from the district's administrators. Defend your position in terms of the good or evil you see in the ES'70 efforts to create change.

WILLINGBORO
New Jersey

You are a member of a Board of Education with the majority of the Board behind you. You are trying to invoke policies that will create change. Your superintendent and principals are at odds with you. You have one year to go in office and then you wish to try for re-election. Defend your position in terms of the good or evil you see in the ES'70 efforts to create change.

EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM FOR THE SEVENTIES
ES '70
A COOPERATIVE PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION

WILLINGBORO
New Jersey

You are a member of the Board of Education who feels that his school system is failing the children because the "tried and true" methods of education have not been enforced. There are too many new things in the system. Changes have been made inappropriately. Data created on the performance of the children backs your argument. You are in the minority on the Board but the principals are with you. Defend your position in terms of the good or evil you see in the ES'70 efforts to create change.

WILLINGBORO
New Jersey

You are an older superintendent whose principals are crying for change. You have reluctantly entered the ES'70 Corporation. Your Board of Education is ambivalent. Defend your position in terms of the good or evil you see in the ES'70 efforts to create change.

WILLINGBORO
New Jersey

You are a superintendent of schools who is young and ambitious. Your rise to the top has been fast and you are convinced that the individualized program is essential for the best learning situation. You would like to implement this on a K-12 basis. Your board and the administrators involved are reluctant to change. Your job is on the line. Defend your position in terms of the good or evil you see in the ES'70 efforts to create change.

WILLINGBORO
New Jersey

You are a principal of a large high school. The routines of the high school, the scheduling, and the staff are all elements that are welded together. You are reluctant to even consider change because of the problems involved and your own feelings of frustration which come from the realization that change is inevitable. Defend your position in terms of the good or evil you see in the ES'70 efforts to create change.

EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM FOR THE SEVENTIES
ES '70
A COOPERATIVE PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION

WILLINGBORO
New Jersey

You are a principal of a rather large high school. You are trying to implement change. You would like your staff to graduate from the traditional methodology to a more individualized program. You have heard that this is a good idea. You have never had a chance to practice it as a teacher, but you feel that as a principal this would look good on your record. Defend your position in terms of the good or evil you see in the ES'70 efforts to create change.

WILLINGBORO
New Jersey

Your are a teacher in an individualized environment who is partly sold on the use of packets, but who is committed to this methodology and to administration. There is a flickering flame of resentment in you. Defend your position in terms of the good or evil you see in the ES'70 efforts to create change.

WILLINGBORO
New Jersey

You are a teacher who has been successful throughout the years. You are accepted by your colleagues and you see no reason to change your approach to any sort of individualized nonsense. Defend your position in terms of the good or evil you see in the ES'70 efforts to create change.

WILLINGBORO
New Jersey

You are a student in an individualized environment and you refuse to work on your Learning Packets. Further, you constantly annoy the other sudents. Your attitude is largely one of resentment. Your teacher and the administration insist upon using learning packages. Defend your position in terms of the good or evil you see in the ES'70 efforts to create change.

EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM FOR THE SEVENTIES
ES '70
A COOPERATIVE PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION

WILLINGBORO
New Jersey

You are a student who thrives in the individualized environment created by your school systems use of the learning packets. You are far ahead of others in your class. However, certain of your basic problems of growing up seem to have no solutions. There is a scratchy feeling of insecurity inside you. Explain your position in terms of the good or evil you see in the ES'70 efforts to create change.

EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM FOR THE SEVENTIES
ES '70
A COOPERATIVE PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION

WILLINGBORO
New Jersey

You are a happy student when using the individualized packets. You are successful in school but you have learned to play games with your teacher and the packets which give you much free time. You have a feeling that your education is only touching the surface of life. Several of your buddies are experimenting with sex and drugs. Explain your position in terms of the good or evil you see in the ES'70 efforts to create change.

APPENDIX #2

WILLINGBORO
New Jersey

ES '70 WORKSHOP
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

MARCH 25TH, WEDNESDAY

9:00 a.m.	Opening:	T. S. Dietz E. G. Spack	
	Introduction to program:	T. S. Dietz	
	Hand outs:	a. Role assignments b. Group assignments	
9:45 a.m.	Coffee		
10:00 a.m.	To groups with roles assigned		
12:00	Lunch		
1:00 p.m.	Dr. Irvin Nikolai Philadelphia Willingboro		Group A Group B Group C
2:30 p.m.	Break		
3:00 p.m.	Willingboro Dr. Irvin Nikolai Philadelphia		Group A Group B Group C

WILLINGBORO
New Jersey

ES'70 WORKSHOP
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

MARCH 26TH, THURSDAY

9:00 a.m.	Philadelphia	Group A
	Willingboro	Group B
	Dr. Edward Brainard	Group C
10:30 a.m.	Break	
10:45 a.m.	Feedback from group leaders - Listing:	
	1. Identification of the change agent (s).	
	a. His (their) role (s), activities	
	b. Place in the hierarchy	
	2. Plans for fostering change?	
12:00	Lunch	
1:30 p.m.	Reaction Panel (Reacting to feedback in terms of implementation methods for ES'70 change agents:	
	Dr. Irvin Nikolai	
	Dr. Edward Brainard	
	Mr. Eliot G. Spack	
	Mr. George Love	
	plus,	
	students	
	coordinators and participants	

APPENDIX #3

WILLINGBORO
New Jersey

INTRODUCTION

This workshop is intended to be different - - - let's hope it is. Your activities are scheduled, but your actions and reactions will make the difference between this workshop and others apparent.

The structure of the two days is not so different excepting in that you are not to be yourself. We hope you will carry out the role assigned to you for at least a day and a half. Come back to earth the second half of the second day to have another look at your true role and your situation.

Insofar as it goes, the above explains the workshop . . . . you have your work cut out. Translated: we have told you what to do and if the whole thing is a mess it is your fault, so there!

Now as to the why of the structure. . . .ES'70 has been struggling in a morass of polysyllabic words and phrases, some of which has been understood and some of which has been misinterpreted. There has been some movement in the family of districts, as in a "Chinese fire drill" - - old G. I. saying meaning things are not focussed. Yet, the officials of each district will swear as to the purity of heart of each of the doers. Each explains his direction in terms of local expediency. But it does seem that the cart is still before the horse.

The LAPS, the LEMS, the PACKETS, or whatever are not doing the job for all. Teachers are asked to do jobs they have little skill for. Children are asked to assume an eagerness for that for which they have been poorly prepared. The DOERS struggle from one crises to another.

What then should be the role of the E3'70 coordinator, the change agent and his immediate changer, the principal?

What sorts of activities are within his rightful role?

How can he achieve the status and "power" he needs to achieve, to change, so as to get the results he must have?

What sort of a vehicle is necessary to effect change?

We hope you will enter into this workshop with a true shedding of your position and preconceived ideas of the roles and positions of others. Your roles have been assigned with some thought. How valid the thought we shall see. If you are at sea, disturbed with your role so much the better. Call upon your experience with those in the actual roles assigned to you. How do they act, seemingly feel, and react to others in the school situation?

Given your present situation, the hierarchy of power in which you work, the demands of the State Department of Education and the community, you are to prepare three methods for the implementation of change within your district. These must be cost-free. If two of the three methods are accepted by the administration and board you may be considered successful in your efforts with the administration. If, when you attempt to implement your two methods one seems to be workable with the staff and building administrator, you will be assumed an effective change agent. List the changes in your own behavior and the changes that occurred in the behavior of your colleagues. Outline the product of the change.

Lurking in the minds of each of us in the day-to-day activities of the job are certain feelings about one's situation and colleagues that have best been explained by Potter in his book "One Upmanship", further clarified by Parkinson in his enumeration of the various Parkinson Laws, and by your own recognition of the operation of the Peter Principle. Further than this, people do play games as Eric Berne has pointed out. All of the fears, traps, and communications pitfalls we find in the daily job must be left behind in this workshop. If we are to achieve a different view of ourselves and the change agents we are, we must put aside the childish play toys of the "real" world and meet with ourselves.

APPENDIX #4

GLOSSARY

change	To give a different position, course, or direction to
agent	Something that produces or is capable of producing an effect: an active or efficient course.
new	Being other than the former or old (model)
response	The output of a transducer or detecting device resulting from a given input.
train	To form by instruction, discipline, or drill
develop	To cause to grow and differentiate along lines natural to its kind.
Innovatah	You
staff	The personnel who assist a director in carrying out an assigned task.
arrange	To put in proper order: dispose

APPENDIX #5

THOUGHTS ON THE RESPONSIVE CURRICULUM

With the advent of the new federal administration the whole tone of government funding has changed. I think it can be stated fairly that professional educators do not hold the position of high esteem that they once held. The reasons for this are fairly obvious. The history of ESEA Title I and Title III, particularly, shows us that many dollars have gone down the drain. Perhaps this was necessary. The original import of the education act was to improve education. Educators who had been operating upon a shoe string for years suddenly had money and didn't really know how to use it. Many were efforts abortive in nature, pie-in-the-sky, situated on cloud nine.

The boys and girls told us this before the new administration took office, and yet, educators hide, still blaming the lack of money and the lack of personnel as well as uncooperative students. But blame for past failures lies directly on the heads of the educators.

Thus far, the curriculum offerings of our schools have not been responsive to the students needs as he sees them, nor to the problems that he faces while growing into adulthood.

Adults face problems now that are child's play compared to those problems our youngsters will face. Some of the present problems revolve around the power struggle between nations - the ABM - Vietnam - the population explosion, the problems of the basics of life - and man's ecology coupled with the decay and uselessness of cities. Transportation and distribution of goods and services, creeping mediocrity of goods and services, public information by media all add a hysterical flavor to the problems of adults' society. The concept of self,

and being an individual, the search for a way of group survival, man's power drives concern us all.

The high school youngsters interviewed for this paper gave evidence of many of the same concerns. In addition, they say that schools are run on a "group total basis." Disciplinary measures in the schools are simply "a challenge" to disrupt. "Teachers are prejudiced," and the school offerings are of little help in race relations. "There is no sense of honesty." Respect between the groups is absent. In summation, there is a dearth of human communications that is terrorizing our young people. A responsive curriculum must offer solutions to these problems. It must be relevant to the youngsters in this day and time and, hopefully, to them in the future. It must be responsive to individual learning patterns and needs, and it must be a manageable, and not bankrupt society.

If there is some sort of disagreement on the part of the reader at this point he had best destroy this paper. If there is some agreement with this point of view I would suggest that he continue.

The responsive curriculum is that which does away with the absurdities of the subject areas. In order to be truly responsive to youngsters needs and problems it is inappropriate to segment the information he will have to use in order to solve his problems. There is no skill nor subject that can be taught out of context with life and other skills. There is no problem that can be solved by science alone, or math, or spelling, or English. Yet, we teach youngsters through the use of specialized areas and say to the immature mind, now you have the math, science, English, social studies, et cetera and you

are educated while leaving to this youngster the solution to his growing problems. He selects bits and pieces of information from each area and tries to put them together into a solution.

Often enough he has been taught neither how to select, nor how to assemble this information. Therefore, his bag of tools, though honed and sharpened, are often used improperly or not at all.

A responsive curriculum must be a complete reversal of what has been taught. The base must be those larger problems of growing up such as the communication, the economics of nations, groups, and individuals, the ecology of mankind, and group and personal behavior. If such broad areas were broken down with subject specialists contributing knowledge and re- assembled objectivly, we could approach a truly interdisciplinary curriculum. Further, this curriculum could be based on those individual needs of youngsters as he himself would help to identify, he would be involved thoroughly in the design of his own education.

Many people disagree with this approach for it is far beyond the standard approach to learning problems. It takes the heart out of the subject-matter centered curriculum which is easily taught. This approach assumes that teachers are broad enough to accept this kind of responsibility and brings us to the first and obviously the most crucial step in the evolution of a new program. That is, the creation and implementation of a staff development program.

All too often what is called development is simply staff training. Charlie Innovatah conceives an idea, gets some sort of administrative backing and

then runs down the halls of his school or checks over the master staff list looking for people who might not be too threatened by something different. If, Charlie finds several people he attempts to approach them individually. Something in this manner. Charlie, "Say, Max, I just had an idea I thought I would bounce off you." This is a patent lie because Charlie has already figured this thing out to the nth degree. Max in his turn, and if he has any respect for Charle, usually thinks, "Well, it can't hurt to listen, he is a pretty good egg." If Max is not quite so friendly but competent in his work he will think to himself, "What the hell is he up to now and why should I change!" At any rate, Charlie goes ahead and if he can elicit some sort of warm response, not even a hot response, only a lukewarm response, he reports success to his superiors and barrels into a program of training, not a program of development. This training is simply the reorganization of existing capabilities into a different format and usually employing the same subject matter structure.

If this training is touted as being individualized, it usually means that a participant will have been construed to be more or less proficient to begin with; and, therefore, have to suffer through fewer of the training sessions. In none of this is the individual expected to change basically. He may still hate kids, he may still view his administrator and/or the building as archaic and crumbling, and be thankful that there are kids in the community because he really does need a job.

The pattern has changed little.

Unless educators take bold action, unless they pull themselves up squarely and face established opposition, the educational effort will continue to be mechanized.

If one looks closely at one of the most advertised learning programs in mathematics one finds that the program essentials are excellent from diagnosing the individual, to the pacing, to the remedial work. There is nothing in the elements of this program that is artistry. Every facet of this program is the mechanization of the teacher's role.

This tells us that teachers are inadequate, poorly developed, (no pun intended), and the mechanized programs are a substitution for the artistry of teaching. If this substitution were truly valuable, enlightening, and artistic it could be supported, but it tends to dehumanize both the teacher and the pupil.

Bright people without artistry reduce education to a canned steps of "progress." This can be called individualized instruction; it can be called progress; but it cannot be called personalized instruction. It doesn't develop the student and his propensities, but offers rather an inhuman ladder of tasks to be performed.

If we are to approach the interdisciplinary curriculum it must be humanized. The very nature of the ES'70 concept, although systemized, is based upon human problems of boys and girls and society. As mentioned earlier, the problems of the older people in the establishment of education are not exactly those problems of the youngsters. Each age of an individual brings with it different problems. By the simple accumulation of years one finds

himself with responsibilities and problems that were not visited upon him in earlier periods of his life. If our curriculum is to be truly relevant, the problems and situations of each of life's periods must be delineated and approached.

In the public schools we can pave the way for individuals growing up in our society. We can give them a methodology, a philosophy, a manner of thought that could well become part of their personalities and provide for successful learning experiences throughout their lives. We must embrace the thorny process of change. We must create not rearrange.

APPENDIX #6

E.S.'70 WORKSHOP
SANTA FE, N.M.

EVALUATION

QUESTION #1.

How this workshop assisted you in clarifying your position as a change agent?

YES	NO
10	0

QUESTION #2.

Do you feel that the workshop has helped you to recognize change as opposed to rearrangement?

YES	NO
10	0

QUESTION #3.

Briefly comment on which aspect was most helpful and why.

Having teachers and administrators explain the changes which they have initiated was helpful.

I really had looked forward to the two days workshop in the writing of behavioral objectives. As a teacher, I needed this practical aspect for the classroom. However, I realize the schedule had to be changed.

Group session - Willingboro - A good summary of the Willingboro set up was given. Participants played roles well. Relevant questions & problems were brought up and a logical plan of attack suggested.

I especially benefitted from the session on Willingboro's individualized in-service program as that is what we're working on at present.

I found the morning session (March 25, 1970) psychodrama to be most helpful. The interchange of ideas concerning change as opposed to rearrangement that so often is the case.

I particularly enjoyed the Vice-Principal from Willingboro and his explanation of the Willingboro plan for change. Some of his ideas I can use.

E.S.'70 WORKSHOP
SANTA FE, N.M.

EVALUATION

QUESTION #3. cont'd.

I enjoyed the comments by Dr. Nikolai regarding the role of the change agent and the chance to play a different role in order to stimulate reactions. I especially liked the way that everyone was involved in the group discussions.

The most helpful session for me was the feedback session on Thursday morning. Of course, I realize that it depended upon all that went before.

Dr. Nikolai's session. (5pts.).

Summary session on Thursday A.M. with Dr. Brainard.

Varied role playing of change agents to meet same goals. Opened up her vistas of thought and process for same change agent in different situations.

#2 above more helpful. #1 above has been clear for some time. I especially enjoyed the group sessions with the "practitioners".

The whole agenda Tom, Could I have a set of the roles? I would like to use them in Baltimore.

QUESTION #4.

Briefly comment on which aspect was least helpful and why.

I think the role playing was least helpful. The people present were adequately resourceful to interpret change without this instrument of communication. Further, that we need change was evident before we arrived in Santa Fe; some of the role playing was geared to whether change was needed or not. I found this a little unnecessary. Fortunately, in our group, we abandoned roles many times.

E.S.'70 WORKSHOP
SANTA FE, N.M.

EVALUATION

QUESTION #4 cont'd.

My group session with the Philadelphia People. Th majority of the time was spent discussing their Philadelphia problem. Little time was spent discussing solutions, plan of attack, alternatives.

The role play was a good idea but people were "out of role" more than "in".

The afternoon sessions were not as helpful. However the dialogue with Dr. Nicolai was enjoyable. Tom, I think your plan was good and it was "on target". The execution of the plan depended on the persons involved and sometimes went astray (I admit that I was one of the persons involved). May I summarize by simply saying "GOOD SHOW", Mr. Dietz.

The session with the teachers from Philadelphia, did not develop for me -- probably because it was the third in a series and late in the day.

Session with Philadelphia, Pa., too much defense of structure.

Group leaders not clear as to their role as a member of the different groups. A great deal of time spent on defining this role for leaders as each group meets.

Extent of time placed on change agent status. Very reluctant to previous meetings. Good conference in overall.

NAME:_____

DISTRICT:_____

ES'70 WORKSHOP

1. Has this workshop assisted you in clarifying your position as a change agent?

/____/ Yes /____/ No

2. Do you feel that the workshop has helped you to recognize change as opposed to rearrangement.

/____/ Yes /____/ No

3. Briefly comment on which aspect was most helpful and why.

4. Briefly comment on which aspect was least helpful and why.

APPENDIX #7

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION OF SANTA FE WORKSHOP

1.		High. Eff.	Mod. Eff.	Rel. Ineff.	Poor	Totals
	A.	6	13	3	0	22
	B.	4	13	2	0	19
2.		High. Eff.	Mod. Eff.	Rel. Ineff.	Poor	
	A.	15	3	0	0	18
	B.	5	8	4	2	19
	C.	5	10	3	1	19
	D.	6	13	1	0	20
3.		High.Use.	Mod. Use.	Rel.Nonuse.	Poor	
		5	14	2	0	21
4.		Well Plan.	Mod.Well Plan.	Poorly Plan.		
		17	5	1		23
5.		Very Imp.	Mod. Imp.	Not. Imp.		
		4	14	5		23
6.		High.Eff.	Mod. Eff.	Rel. Ineff.	Poor	
		10	6	7	0	23
7.		High.Eff.	Mod. Eff.	Rel. Ineff.	Poor	
		9	10	4	0	23
8.		High.Eff.	Mod. Eff.	Rel. Ineff.	Poor	
		6	13	4	0	23
9.		High.Eff.	Mod. Eff.	Rel. Ineff.	Poor	
		9	9	3	1	22
10.		High.Use.	Mod.Use.	Rel.Nonuse.	Poor	
		8	7	4	0	19
11.		Yes.	No.	Maybe	Prob. Not	
		10	5	6	1	22
12.		High.Val.	Mod. Val.	Rel.Non-Val.	Not. Val.	
		14	7	0	0	21
TOTALS:		133	150	49	5	

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION OF SANTA FE WORKSHOP

COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS PERTAINING TO QUESTIONS

1. Role playing group and summarizing panel.

   a. Role playing "lost its luster" after one shot.
   b. Role playing seemed to lose its novelty effect after doing it once.
   c. After the first session, my group did not play roles, but we learned a great deal by asking questions that relate to our real life situations. This was more helpful to me.
   d. Effectiveness - to what criteria?
   e. Creighton is a "lousy" role player. This type of activity bothers me - people keep reverting to "self" and I keep trying to determine when a person is "self" and when he is "role - and I lost effectiveness in the process,
   f. Not enough time to prepare for summarizing panel.
   g. Make certain that members have read their homework.
   h. Include time for discussion covering sub group report.
   i. Small group varied in effectiveness according to the individual participants and the time of day. Feel some members abandoned the role playing, and seized on this as an opportunity to find the "chink in the armor". Better to attempt more positive direction than negative.

2. Effectiveness of consultants in role playing group. (4)

   a. Commend Joe O'Donnell in his enthusiasm for changing educational environment in his school.
   b. Consultants simply not of equal merit. They described, not consulted.
   c. Effectiveness - what criteria?
   d. Doreen Rhose has a lot to learn about the public school business.
   e. Felt B & C not fully committed to the concept of individualized instruction.

3. Usefulness of reference materials.

   a. T.H. learning packages were very good.
   b. Usefulness - how?
   c. Role of teacher as different from administrator made a big difference.

4. Workshop

   a. Well planned - for what?
   b. Diversity of local responsibility made planning difficult.
   c. Very shoddy planning. No real effort to respond to stated objective. Weak assistance by consultants. Could have been an effective experience - in retrospect, it wasn't.
   d. Appeared that the 2 days experience was well arranged. At the end people seemed to be fading. Cannot judge total experience.

5. Workshop - 3 methods for implementation of change.

   a. Change strategies have to be complicated and precise to move through the monolithic admin. structure of moderately sized district.
   b. Type of change?
   c. Administration directed as it should be, no significance.
   d. They did not describe 3 methods for implementing change; they described their innovations.
   e. I was able to coordinate a workshop within my community.

6. Effectiveness in identifying agents for change.

   a. No correlation.

SANTA FE WORKSHOP

COMMENTS & SUGGESTIONS

6. b. We use a participating team effort which has many bugs to be worked out, so it is more difficult to see clear cut effectiveness.
   c. Thought I could identify them before.

7. Effectiveness in identifying roles & activities.

   a. Somewhat of a review.
   b. Dr. Nickolai was particularly helpful.
   c. Same as #6b.

8. Degree of effectiveness for you.

   a. Doesn't necessarily happen that way.
   b. Somewhat of a review.
   c. I already had pretty well formulated ideas on this.
   d. Interesting to see how the concept of this position varies from place to place. I tended to see all ES '70 coordinators as doing the same thing, but I see the role as varying with the district's needs.

9. Effectiveness of plans for change.

   a. Already had these ideas.
   b. Only Nickolai, others were a waste of time.
   c. The interaction among the various participants was very good.
   d. Best one so far. Believe this is the true role of the coordinator.

10. Usefulness of packets.

   a. Much of our work is built around 2 on-going projects, which have a

E. S. 70 WORKSHOP
AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR INDIAN ARTS
Santa Fe, New Mexico
March 25 and 26, 1970

Director: Mr. Thomas Dietz
E.S. 70 Coordinator
Willingboro School District
Willingboro, New Jersey

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION OF WORKSHOP

Directions: Place a check mark in the box which best describes your evaluation of the statement. Use the space following each statement and rating scale to write any comments and suggestions.

1. We engaged in two kinds of activity groups. Please rate the effectiveness of each.

2. There were four consultants available for the three groups. Please rate each consultant's effectiveness as a group leader in the role playing group.

	Highly effective	Moderately effective	Relatively ineffective	Poor
A. Dr. Nickolai	☐	☐	☐	☐
B. Doreen Rhode (Philadelphia)	☐	☐	☐	☐
C. David Shore (Philadelphia)	☐	☐	☐	☐
D. Joseph O'Donnell (Willingboro)	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments and suggestions:

4. How well was the workshop planned?

☐ Well planned ☐ Moderately well planned

☐ Poorly planned

Comments and suggestions:

5. The stated purpose for the workshop was to prepare three methods for the implementation of change within your district. How important was this purpose in giving you direction for implementing change?

☐ Very important ☐ Moderately important ☐ Not important

Comments and suggestions:

6. How effective was the workshop in helping you to identify the agents for change in your district?

☐ Highly effective ☐ Moderately effective

☐ Relatively ineffective ☐ Poor

Comments and suggestions:

7. How effective was the workshop in helping you to identify the roles and activities for change agents?

☐ Highly effective ☐ Moderately effective

☐ Relatively ineffective ☐ Poor

Comments and suggestions:

8. To what degree was the workshop effective in helping you to identify and support the E. S. 70 Coordinator's place in a district's hierarchy?

☐ Highly effective ☐ Moderately effective

☐ Relatively ineffective ☐ Poor

Comments and suggestions:

9. How effective was the workshop in giving you ideas to help you develop plans for fostering change in your district?

☐ Highly effective ☐ Moderately effective

☐ Relatively ineffective ☐ Poor

Comments and suggestions:

10. Each of you received a set of packets which is an in-service program to teach teachers how to write single-concept learning packets focusing on behavioral objectives. Please rate their usefulness to you.

☐ Highly useful ☐ Moderately useful

☐ Relatively nonuseful ☐ Poor

Comments and suggestions:

11. Do you plan on using the above in-service program to teach teachers how to write single-concept learning packets?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Maybe

Comments and suggestions:

12. Do you believe this particular kind of workshop presented on a quarterly or semi-annual basis, relating to pertinent problems, would be valuable to the E.S. Coordinators?

☐ Highly valuable ☐ Moderately valuable

☐ Relatively non-valuable ☐ Not valuable

Comments and suggestions: